

GROSSE POINTE MEMORIAL CHURCH

REV. FRANK FITT, PASTOR

16 LAKE SHORE ROAD

GROSSE POINTE FARMS, MICHIGAN

*Referred to the Speech*

Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.,  
156 Fifth Avenue,  
New York City

November 12, 1931

17

My dear Dr. Brown:

Recently I sent to all the members of our General Council and to all the members of our representation on the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America the statement which I am now sending to you. The statement deals with the task entrusted to the General Council by the last General Assembly regarding the Federal Council.

This statement is sent privately to about one hundred and fifty ministers of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., all of them my personal friends or men whom I have met at General Assemblies in former years. The statement explains itself and has been forwarded to those in authority in the hope that it may be of some service.

If you care to do so I should be very glad to hear from you in regard to the main points which I seek to establish in my statement to the General Council.

Sincerely yours,

*Frank Fitt*

Frank Fitt

FF:ES

**GROSSE POINTE MEMORIAL CHURCH**

REV. FRANK FITT, PASTOR

16 LAKE SHORE ROAD

GROSSE POINTE FARMS, MICHIGAN

November 6, 1931

Secretary  
The General Council of the  
Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.  
156 Fifth Avenue,  
New York City

To the Members of the General Council of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

Gentlemen:

At the last General Assembly, at Pittsburgh, it was decided "that the whole question of the construction of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the participation in it by the Presbyterian Church be carefully considered by the General Council, and that through the General Council the Federal Council be instructed hereafter to hold its peace on questions of delicacy and morality, until the General Assembly has had an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon them." This resolution was passed after the General Assembly had reconsidered its former decision to discontinue financial support of the Federal Council of Churches.

It is in connection with this resolution that I respectfully submit this letter.

In recent months I have had occasion to make a rather detailed study of the Federal Council. This study was brought about by my realization that some of our laymen are profoundly aroused regarding pronouncements which have been made from time to time by the Federal Council on matters upon which there is considerable disagreement of opinion among Christian people at large. These

pronouncements are given forth on the assumption that they represent the voice of Protestantism. A few of these laymen have laid this matter before me and have submitted to me their correspondence with the main office of the Federal Council. I confess that I find the points raised by these laymen difficult to answer, even though I have been at great pains to study just what the Federal Council is supposed to be.

The basis of misunderstanding regarding this matter is due to the fact that, so far as I can find out, there is no clear-cut understanding of just how much or how little authority the Federal Council has. In going through official publications I find references which seem to indicate that it is entirely subordinate to the denominations which help to support it. On the other hand, I find statements which seem to indicate otherwise. Within the past few weeks, the Rev. S. M. Cavert, the present secretary of the Federal Council, has published an article (Federal Council Bulletin, September, 1931, pages 1, 2, and 3) which indicates that there is no general agreement as to just what powers his organization may or may not have. In this article he lays down several tentative proposals. It seems extraordinary that the chief official on the staff should be writing an article of that sort after the Federal Council has been in existence for over twenty years.

According to my own point of view there are only two possible positions for the Federal Council of Churches.

In the first place, it can be a clearing-house for Protestantism, dealing with all such matters as can be handled more conveniently and effectively through one general head than through many. I refer to such matters as the publication of the Lenten Booklet of devotional readings, the support of the Protestant work

in Europe, the assistance in the appointment of chaplains for the army and navy, and the appointment of commissions for fact-finding purposes. As the servant of Protestantism in that sense our Federal Council is very much needed and along these lines it has performed so far a very worthy service.

In the second place, the Federal Council of Churches can be regarded in relation to Protestantism very much as the Pope and College of Cardinals are regarded in relation to Roman Catholicism. There is no question that in its official pronouncements the Federal Council at times seems to be under the conviction that it possesses this kind of authority. In recent years, I have read passages from the annual reports which filled me with wonder. The Federal Council had no hesitation one year in claiming power to have millions of signatures of Protestant people sent to Washington for the direct exercising of political pressure. Is this a wholesome claim? Is it truly representative of our Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.?

The whole genius of Protestantism make it impossible and inadvisable to have any organization like the Federal Council making pronouncements upon which there are decided differences among Christian people. My judgment is that the purposes of the Federal Council are in serious need of re-definition. I am hoping very much that the directions given to the General Council by the last General Assembly will result in bringing this matter, which is now so confused, into a clear and well-defined light. I realize that the matter demands tact and delicacy, but I am convinced that, unless this confusion can be cleared up, there will continue to be a considerable amount of dissatisfaction and regret on the part of many intelligent and devoted Protestants.

Respectfully yours,

  
Frank Fitt

**GROSSE POINTE MEMORIAL CHURCH**

REV. FRANK FITT, PASTOR

16 LAKE SHORE ROAD

GROSSE POINTE FARMS, MICHIGAN

November 6, 1931

Secretary  
The General Council of the  
Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.,  
156 Fifth Avenue,  
New York City

To the Members of the General Council of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.  
Gentlemen:

The Reverend C. Franklin Ward, in acknowledging the receipt of my communication to you of last October fifteenth regarding the Federal Council of Churches, has informed me that the Administrative Committee of the General Council will meet in Chicago on November seventeenth next. I desire to lay before you more detailed information regarding the Federal Council of Churches to supplement that contained in my previous letter.

I desire to reiterate my statement made previously, that the last thing I desire is the harm of the Federal Council of Churches as it was originally conceived and as its published purpose declares, namely,

"...to promote the spirit of fellowship, service and cooperation among the Churches of Christ in America, to secure larger efficiency in their work, to endeavor to prevent their duplication of effort and expenditure and to increase their influence by united action in every department of their operations, at home and abroad". (Act of Incorporation - Section 2).

In the fulfillment of that purpose, the Federal Council of Churches has accomplished a work for which the Christian constituency of our land can well be grateful. My contention is, how-

ever, that there are certain phases of the work and functioning of the Federal Council of Churches which stand in need of correction if the continued and hearty support of the men and women of the Churches is to be kept up. The action of our last General Assembly has placed upon the General Council of our church a task in which the opportunity for correction is given. That is my purpose in this communication.

After making a fairly thorough study of the reports and publications of the Federal Council of Churches I came to the conclusion that the basic problem involved was one of authority. This I indicated in my letter of October fifteenth. This problem, however, is related to two other points; and it is upon those that I desire to submit more detailed and definite information for your consideration.

(1) The first point raises the question as to whether the Federal Council of Churches engages in political activity of a sort which fails to observe the distinction between Church and State which has been traditional in the history of our country, and of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

"Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate".- (The Confession of Faith, Chapter 31, Section 4).

There is no question at all that the Federal Council claims that it is not engaged in political activity in any objectionable sense. In the Annual Report for 1929, page 11, are the following words:

"In order to avoid any possible misunderstanding on points that we ordinarily take for granted as settled in our Christian

thinking, let it be entirely clear that we are wholly opposed to a church, as a corporate group 'going into politics' in the sense of allying itself with any political party, or resorting to the methods of partisan campaigns, or using any sort of political threat or external coercion. The Church, as a body of people believing in the supremacy of moral and spiritual ideals, need not, and should not, adopt such methods of achieving its aims".

The Executive Committee of the Federal Council passed the following resolution at its annual meeting in Chicago in December, 1929:

"The Federal Council has carefully refrained from maintaining at Washington or elsewhere, any lobbyist or legislative representative and from using any form of political or personal pressure or partisan alignment, and has relied wholly on the moral power of its statements to influence public opinion".

From these statements the case would seem to be clear namely, that the Federal Council has been content to declare itself on great moral problems before our country and trust to the faith and intelligence of its constituency to apply them in terms of the polling-booth when the occasion served.

It is somewhat confusing, however, in the light of these statements, to confront these further statements.

In April, 1926, the Rev. Samuel M. Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council, appeared before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs at the hearings on the Capper-Johnson Bill. He opened his testimony by saying:

"I am one of the general secretaries of the Federal Council of Churches, which, as I have no doubt you know, is a federation of twenty-eight Protestant Churches"

He stated that the attitude of the Federal Council on the pending legislation was expressed in two sentences from a resolution adopted by its Administrative Committee, as follows:

"We believe that any program of war-time conscription should be put into force only by act of Congress with reference to a specific emergency. We record strong convictions that whenever human life is subject to conscription, material forces should be conscripted with equal clearness and vigor".

He then pointed out that these resolutions did not mention the Capper-Johnson Bill and then made this statement:

"It is not the ordinary practice of the Federal Council of Churches to endorse or oppose specific measures as such. These resolutions, however, lay down certain principles in the light of which it has seemed to the Administrative Committee of the Federal Council of Churches that to oppose a measure, which proposes, as this measure does, to put into effect a far-reaching program of conscription, is necessary". (Hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, Sixty-ninth Congress, pages 86 and 87).

In "Twenty Years of Church Federation", 1928, edited by the Rev. Samuel M. Cavert, there is a report on "International Justice and Goodwill", signed by Mr. George W. Wickersham as chairman, the late Bishop Charles H. Brent as vice-chairman, and the Rev. Sidney L. Gulick as executive secretary. On page 91 are found these words:

"Among the political procedures looking toward peace, to which the churches gave remarkably active support, was the highly successful Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament in 1921-22. According to the report of a special committee of the Conference, the number of names signed to letters, telegrams, and petitions sent to Washington was 13,878,671, of which more than 12,500,000 wrote in a way that showed that they were acting as the result of the campaign among the churches".

The following quotation is from the "Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 71st Congress, 2nd Session, Part 9, page 3772:

"Mr. Tinkham. 'I have either received letters or propaganda from this organization (the Federal Council of Churches) with relation to:



1. United States and Japanese relations.
2. Extra territoriality in China.
3. The 1927 Navy building program.
4. International relations between the United States and Mexico in relation to the Mexican petroleum law of 1925.
5. The 1928 Navy building program as recommended by the President.
6. The League of Nations.
7. Increase of armaments.
8. The World Court.
9. The Peace Pact.
10. Pan-American arbitration treaty.
11. Arms embargo.
12. War Debts.
13. Naturalization.
14. Compulsory military training in high schools and colleges.
15. Appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.'"

On the same occasion, Senator Caraway said:

"Yes, I have received a great deal of literature from them".

Other quotations of the same sort, reflecting what appears to be a direct contradiction of the statements of the Federal Council regarding its policy towards political questions, could be presented. I am content to submit those given above. All of them can be verified. Do they, or do they not, indicate that the Federal Council of Churches, on occasion, enters into politics to a degree contrary to our established tradition and practice? If it be true that the Federal Council is willing to enter politics in a sense which is contrary to our tradition and practice, should the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. continue its recognition, financially and otherwise, of the Federal Council?

My judgment is that a very definite issue arises at this point. In "The Handbook of the Churches" for 1927, edited by Benjamin S. Winchester, the Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, D.D., at that time president of the Federal Council, writes as follows, on page 7:

"The day is past when any realm of our economic, industrial, social, political, or

international life will be regarded as outside the sphere of responsibility of the churches"

Taken in the light of what I have already submitted, does Dr. Cadman imply that the aim of the Federal Council is a united Protestant Church which shall dictate to the State?

In order that I may make my point perfectly clear, I should like to submit two further quotations--neither of them dealing directly with the Federal Council. These quotations illustrate the issue which I believe to be involved.

The first quotation is taken from a recent pronouncement by a professor in a theological seminary (not Presbyterian, U.S.A.)

"The minister should be prepared to take a definite stand upon specific political measures ...The American public is in great need of a clear and forceful presentation of the moral consequences of such matters as the League of Nations, the World Court, the tariff legislation, laws relating to trusts and corporations, laws relating to profit sharing and representation in industry, moral benefits from a government department of education, moral implications of the minimum wage law, workmen's insurance, and child labor. It is part of a minister's duty to distinguish for his people the ethical elements in proposed laws or changes in political institutions, and to state his position, not only in general but in particular on specific issues".

It would seem as if the Federal Council is in agreement with this point of view. In a personal letter on October 29, 1931, Dean Luther A. Weigle, at present chairman of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Council, assures me that he heartily agrees with it.

Do the members of the General Council of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. endorse the point of view expressed in this quotation? I wish to make it clear that I repudiate it on several grounds. It implies that a minister must be a specialist in economic and political problems. It implies that his people can do very little thinking for themselves in relation to these problems. An active partisan

treatment of such matters in any local church would speedily split it into many fragments. Meanwhile the ministers chief task as a moral and spiritual teacher would be neglected.

The second quotation is taken from "Christian Ethics and Modern Problems" by Dean W. R. Inge, page 415.

"I have written at considerable length on what is sometimes called the Social Question, knowing how much space it fills in the minds of our contemporaries. It is natural that political parties should desire the support of organized religion, and equally natural that the clergy should wish to speak and preach about topics in which their people are interested. But I have already made it clear that the original Gospel was not, except indirectly, a message of social reform, and that the Church has its own message to deliver, a message which it cannot deliver if it mingles in political agitation".

Dean Inge puts in concise form what I have always assumed to be the point of view of our denomination. Certainly it is my own point of view.

(2) The second point which I desire to lay before the General Council raises the question as to whether the Federal Council really represents the twenty-six Protestant denominations which are described in 1931 as its "constituent bodies" and from which it gains financial support.

In this lengthy communication space is lacking for a description in detail of the setting-up of the Federal Council. Presumably the members of the General Council are familiar with it. To any members who may not be familiar with it, I suggest a thorough study of it, because it is at this point also that I am convinced there must be some decided change. (See "Twenty Years of Church Federation", pages 291-296). Some four hundred members officially designated by their denominations comprise the Federal Council and meet once every four years. The Executive Committee, a smaller group

of about one hundred, meets once a year. The active conduct of affairs of the Federal Council, however, is in the hands of the Administrative Committee, a still smaller group, made up of between sixty and seventy members, which meets once a month. Upon that much smaller group and the executive officers and administrative staff rests the real responsibility. However, and this is the main point, there appears to be no very direct relationship, if any, between the laity of the Protestant Churches at large who contribute the funds which make the Federal Council possible and this small group who control the expression of its policies.. There are very few laymen on the Administrative Committee.. The laity have almost nothing to say as to what the Federal Council shall pronounce, although in almost all its publications the Federal Council implies that it is the spokesman of the Churches.

In order that I may be utterly fair, I want to make it clear that the Federal Council states very definitely its conviction that it is subject to the various denominations. In the Annual Report for 1930, page 11, the Rev. Samuel M. Cavert writes as follows:

"Too strong emphasis cannot be given to the fact that the Council has no legal or binding authority over the component churches in any realm whatever. Its only authority is that of the free consent of the members. It stands or falls on its ability to secure approval for its proposals on the basis of their own intrinsic merit. In this respect, it is at the opposite pole from any kind of a hierarchy. The Council is faced with the wholesome necessity of having constantly to restudy and revise its policies and programs in the light of its experience in being able or unable to win voluntary support".

This is a candid, clear and very hopeful statement, all the more hopeful because it indicates a readiness to make changes which I am certain are necessary if the Federal Council is to serve Protestantism to the full extent of its possibility.

In its practical operation, however, events have shown that the somewhat distantly related committees of this organization have not proved effective; nor has it seemed that the Federal Council was "at the opposite pole from any kind of a hierarchy". The evidence for this should be familiar to all the members of the General Council. Undoubtedly there is a growing uneasiness over the tendencies of the Federal Council among the more intelligent of the laity. To my personal knowledge many Presbyterian ministers, of whom I am one, have resented the fact that they had no effective means of protest against some of the pronouncements of the Federal Council. While many of these pronouncements would secure the ready consent of the huge majority of the laity within Protestantism, many others would result in very divided partisan opinion. At least twice our General Assembly has rebuked the Federal Council, once in 1926 and again in 1931, for pronouncements that were clearly out of line with what was judged to be the prevailing opinion of our own Church. Even within the ranks of the inner circle of the Federal Council itself there seems to be some confusion at times as to what is authoritative and what is not. Reports have been given out with full publicity in the press of the country and later these reports thus given by committees of the Federal Council are pronounced as having been released prematurely or without the authorization of the Administrative Committee. The very fact that the General Council of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., has been instructed as it has been by the General Assembly this year in relation to the Federal Council is proof of my contention that the practical operation of a theoretical control by the "constituent bodies" is not effective.

It has been said by some of those who are critical of the Federal Council that its directing group represents only the extreme left wing of Protestantism and not Protestantism as a whole. I make

no such assertions regarding the Federal Council as steered by its Administrative Committee. But I say very readily that anyone who studies the whole history of the situation and who tries to work out just what the set-up of the Federal Council's organization is and just what authority it does or does not possess can easily understand how such statements might be made. For its own sake, as well as for the sake of the Protestantism that stands behind it, the Federal Council should welcome a re-organization which did away with the major grounds of criticism now levelled against it.

I have no suggestion to make in detail as to the type of re-organization demanded. As to the need in general, I will say this: in the system of government which we have in the United States, it is possible for the vote of the citizens to effect the highest offices in the land, to control the policy of the nation, and to prevent leadership from being concentrated too long a time in the hands of any one group. Exactly the same thing is true of our Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. At the present time this is not possible in regard to the Federal Council, certainly not to anything like the same degree as in these other instances. I am absolutely opposed to having the Federal Council enter directly the political arena; but if such a practice should be persisted in, as seems to have been done at times, I should consider that some sort of referendum of clergy and laity alike was necessary before such action was permissible. The same requirements would seem to be necessary before it gave utterance on social and economic problems. If the Federal Council is to serve Protestantism effectively, it should be under some sort of control by which its policies and personnel could be changed if the occasion needed. Something must be done to remove the confusion and misunderstanding that has been arising from time to time.

By way of summary, let me repeat that I believe two important phases of the Federal Council and its workings must be thought through.

(1) In the first place, should not our Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., decide that it can continue to recognize and support the Federal Council only on condition that its policies and pronouncements occasion no justifiable charge that it is crossing the borderline of Church and State?

There will be some within the Federal Council who will oppose this point of view bitterly. In the Annual Report for 1929, page 11, quoting from an editorial in the Federal Council Bulletin, there are these words:

"The latest outcry against the churches denounces them for acting in any organized manner and demands that Christians act only as individuals. But this would be to reduce the Christian influence to sheer impotence. When we live in a world of association--as labor unions, manufacturers' associations, farm bureau federations--Christians must often act collectively or else complacently acquiesce in having no effective influence at all".

The context makes it clear that the writer refers to the entry of the churches directly into politics. The reply, of course, is that Christian men and women are not compelled to remain without organized expression in regard to the political questions of the day. There are many organizations in this country not directly connected with the churches, which represent all degrees of conviction regarding patriotism and economics--the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the National Security League, the Civil Liberties Union, to mention no more--and through which, according to their choice and conviction, they can work. No one particular school of thought in relation to political and social questions should attempt to speak for the entire body of Protestantism.

Just as there is considerable theological difference of opinion within all bodies holding the evangelical faith, so there is difference of opinion among worthy people on questions involving devotion to one's country and to the ordering of our economic structure.

(2) In the second place, should not our Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., decide that it can continue to recognize and support the Federal Council only on condition that its organization be changed in such a manner that there may be a more direct relationship with the Protestant Churches at large, particularly the laity, so that both policies and pronouncements may more accurately reflect the prevailing mind of those whom it represents?

It would seem that no one directly connected with the Federal Council could possibly object to this. Its original statement of purpose reflects this desire. The chief difficulty would be to work out the ideal in practical terms of organization; but some such wide-spread basis of representation must be developed if the more united program we all desire is to be achieved. I am aware, of course, of the recent action taken by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Council in April, 1930, expressed as follows:

"When a public utterance is made, it expresses the carefully considered view of those representative church leaders who have been appointed by the several denominations to serve upon the Council, or its Executive or Administrative Committee, and is put forth in the conviction that it voices a general trend of judgment in the Federal Council's constituency. In formulating such a statement, utterances already made by constituent bodies on the same or similar subjects are given full weight. As in the case of any group composed of delegated representatives, no claim is made for any utterance that it has the unanimous support of all the individual members of the constituency. Actions of the Council become the governing policies of any denomination only to the degree in which they are adopted by that denomination".



I do not regard this position as satisfactory. What is needed is a surer basis of representation for both clergy and laity. Would it be asking too much to suggest that the Federal Council commit itself to no pronouncements which have not already been passed upon by "Constituent bodies" which include at least three quarters of the Protestant membership for which the Federal Council believes that it speaks? Certainly the matter would seem to be one for the trained and experienced leaders, ordained and lay, of the Protestant Churches to work out.

In conclusion, let me state that I submit all of the above only because I am convinced that the truest service to both the Federal Council and to Protestantism is rendered thereby.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Frank Fitt". The signature is written in dark ink and has a fluid, connected style.

Frank Fitt

FF:ES

*William Chalmers Covert, D.D., LL.D., General Secretary.*

*Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.*

*Harold McA. Robinson, D.D. Administrative Secretary*

*Office of the  
Administrative Secretary*

*812 Witherspoon Bldg.  
Philadelphia, Pa.*

November 25, 1931.

*Mr. Inspeers*

TO THE SESSION:

[The General Council at its meeting in Chicago on November 17, 1931, through its Committee on Budget and Finance, studied carefully and in detail the incomes, needs and policies of the four Boards.

As the result of that study, the General Council recommends that the churches give to the Board of Christian Education 17.1% of their benevolence contributions in the year beginning April 1, 1932.

In making up the benevolence budget of your church for the year beginning April 1, 1932, please give due weight to this recommendation of the General Council.

The Board will welcome the opportunity to furnish your Session with any information about the work of the Church committed to it or about its financial condition and policy.]

Very truly yours,

*Harold McA. Robinson*

Harold McA. Robinson,  
Administrative Secretary.

HMR:P

Frank Fitt

GROSSE POINTE MEMORIAL CHURCH

REV. FRANK FITT, PASTOR

16 LAKE SHORE ROAD

GROSSE POINTE FARMS, MICHIGAN

Ans. \_\_\_\_\_

November 6, 1931

Secretary  
The General Council of the  
Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.  
156 Fifth Avenue,  
New York City

To the Members of the General Council of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.  
Gentlemen:

At the last General Assembly, at Pittsburgh, it was decided "that the whole question of the construction of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the participation in it by the Presbyterian Church be carefully considered by the General Council, and that through the General Council the Federal Council be instructed hereafter to hold its peace on questions of delicacy and morality, until the General Assembly has had an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon them." This resolution was passed after the General Assembly had reconsidered its former decision to discontinue financial support of the Federal Council of Churches.

It is in connection with this resolution that I respectfully submit this letter.

In recent months I have had occasion to make a rather detailed study of the Federal Council. This study was brought about by my realization that some of our laymen are profoundly aroused regarding pronouncements which have been made from time to time by the Federal Council on matters upon which there is considerable disagreement of opinion among Christian people at large. These

pronouncements are given forth on the assumption that they represent the voice of Protestantism. A few of these laymen have laid this matter before me and have submitted to me their correspondence with the main office of the Federal Council. I confess that I find the points raised by these laymen difficult to answer, even though I have been at great pains to study just what the Federal Council is supposed to be.

The basis of misunderstanding regarding this matter is due to the fact that, so far as I can find out, there is no clear-cut understanding of just how much or how little authority the Federal Council has. In going through official publications I find references which seem to indicate that it is entirely subordinate to the denominations which help to support it. On the other hand, I find statements which seem to indicate otherwise. Within the past few weeks, the Rev. S. M. Cavert, the present secretary of the Federal Council, has published an article (Federal Council Bulletin, September, 1931, pages 1, 2, and 3) which indicates that there is no general agreement as to just what powers his organization may or may not have. In this article he lays down several tentative proposals. It seems extraordinary that the chief official on the staff should be writing an article of that sort after the Federal Council has been in existence for over twenty years.

According to my own point of view there are only two possible positions for the Federal Council of Churches.

In the first place, it can be a clearing-house for Protestantism, dealing with all such matters as can be handled more conveniently and effectively through one general head than through many. I refer to such matters as the Publication of the Lenten Booklet of devotional readings, the support of the Protestant work

in Europe, the assistance in the appointment of chaplains for the army and navy, and the appointment of commissions for fact-finding purposes. As the servant of Protestantism in that sense our Federal Council is very much needed and along these lines it has performed so far a very worthy service.

In the second place, the Federal Council of Churches can be regarded in relation to Protestantism very much as the Pope and College of Cardinals are regarded in relation to Roman Catholicism. There is no question that in its official pronouncements the Federal Council at times seems to be under the conviction that it possesses this kind of authority. In recent years, I have read passages from the annual reports which filled me with wonder. The Federal Council had no hesitation one year in claiming power to have millions of signatures of Protestant people sent to Washington for the direct exercising of political pressure. Is this a wholesome claim? Is it truly representative of our Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.?

The whole genius of Protestantism make it impossible and inadvisable to have any organization like the Federal Council making pronouncements upon which there are decided differences among Christian people. My judgment is that the purposes of the Federal Council are in serious need of re-definition. I am hoping very much that the directions given to the General Council by the last General Assembly will result in bringing this matter, which is now so confused, into a clear and well-defined light. I realize that the matter demands tact and delicacy, but I am convinced that, unless this confusion can be cleared up, there will continue to be a considerable amount of dissatisfaction and regret on the part of many intelligent and devoted Protestants.

Respectfully yours,

*Frank Fitt*  
Frank Fitt

News from  
Federal Council of the Churches  
of Christ in America  
105 East 22nd Street  
New York City

For immediate release

Abbreviate as desired. Use over my  
signature if preferred.

Samuel McCrea Cavert

DEC 9 1931

#### FEDERAL COUNCIL FACES MANY ISSUES

Ans.

Two major interests absorbed most of the attention of the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches at its annual meeting in Philadelphia, December 2-4. The first was evangelism; the second the functioning of the Council in its relation to the constituent denominations.

The concern with evangelism took the center of the stage in a key-note address by Luther A. Weigle, Dean of the Yale Divinity School and Chairman of the Federal Council's Administrative Committee, on "The Coming Revival of Religion." He interpreted the present extremes of skepticism, the preoccupation with "humanism" and the materialistic temper as precursors of a rebirth of faith, which will arise as an inevitable reaction against views that rob life of its deepest meaning. He called for a fresh witness to the basic Christian convictions and set forth evangelism, not as competing with the emphasis on social service, but as indispensable to any social program that is to have transforming power. He further pleaded for an end to the contrast between evangelism and education, holding that education must become more evangelistic in quality and that evangelism must become more educational in method.

The public meeting was also built around the Christian testimony. Robert E. Speer discussed the meaning of the Gospel for the individual, strongly re-asserting the truth that the final solution of all our social problems rests on the developing of more truly Christian personalities. Charles E. Jefferson spoke on the meaning of the Gospel for the nations, insisting that the Christian way of life is as binding on the nations, in all their complex political and economic relations, as on the individual. The fostering of goodwill toward Jews on the part of Christians was pictured by S. Parkes Cadman as one of the most vital expressions of Christianity, all the more called for because of the long record of unchristian attitudes toward Jews, and as the one effective way of revealing to them the spirit of Christ.

The place of worship in developing the religious life was presented by Dwight Bradley, minister of the First Church in Newton, Mass., and author of the 1932 edition of "The Fellowship of Prayer," who urged on Protestantism a greatly increased attention to cultivating the sense of Divine awareness (and thereby an intense social passion), especially through a perfected use of the historic symbols of the Church. A demonstration of the varied richness of worship was made in the worship periods, led on one day by a priest of the Greek Orthodox Church, Rev. Dr. G. Polizoides, following in part a modified form of its ancient liturgy, and on the second day by Professor Rufus M. Jones, using with equal impressiveness the Quaker method of silence.

The relation of the Council to the denominations was the focus of interest in the report of progress made for the Committee on Function and Structure by its Chairman, George W. Richards, President of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the U. S., who this year became the Chairman also of the Executive Committee of the Council. He forecast that the final report, to

be presented to the Quadrennial Meeting of the Council next year, would deal with the whole genius of church federation, both in relation to the historical development of Protestantism and the path of future advance in securing a larger unity. After outlining the concrete issues that have come before his Committee, with reference both to the structure and the functioning of the Council, Dr. Richards invited the frankest discussion. Lewis S. Mudge, Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, suggested that in the interest of knitting the Council up more closely with the denominations it should henceforth meet biennially instead of quadrennially and that the Executive and the Administrative Committees should be combined into a single body meeting monthly, with the voting membership limited exclusively to those appointed by the denominations. John W. Langdale, Editor of the Methodist Book Concern, addressed himself to the problem of the so-called "pronouncements." He held that it is a great asset to all the denominations to have a collective agency which will not only voice their views on the subjects on which they are agreed, but will also study and shed the best light possible on the more controversial subjects which, just because there is not yet agreement on them, are most in need of study. He admitted that to do this will sometimes lead to criticism, but felt that much of it can be avoided if, first, the number of statements is carefully limited and all are given the most careful scrutiny, and, second, it can be more clear that all the Council's actions are "recommendations" only (as is explicitly stated in its constitution) and that its utterances are not put forth as having any authority over the denominations.

The resulting debate was spirited. No one took the ground that the Council should cease to study and speak on social and international problems; but some held that it should confine its statements to the area within which there is clear agreement in the denominations, while others insisted that, if this were done, the Council would be reduced to "innocuous desuetude." They contended that the Council has come to command great respect just because it has exercised a prophetic leadership. They added, too, that if the new generation is to be held for the Church, it is of the highest importance to have some agency which can view the most difficult current issues from a standpoint wider than that of any single denomination and develop the best possible processes of research, conference and corporate thinking.

When a proposed statement on international affairs was introduced, with a preamble making it clear that in setting forth their own judgments the members of the Committee did not claim to voice the views of others, the consideration of pronouncements moved out of the abstract into the concrete. It was then interesting to see how large a measure of agreement could be reached. All stood for "active and constructive participation" by our country in the coming Disarmament Conference through a delegation of "the strongest possible civilian leaders" and for "not mere limitation," but "actual reduction of significant proportions in military budgets." Holding that "the Gospel injunction that those who are strong ought to bear the burdens of the weak is mandatory on nations no less than on individuals," the statement noted with satisfaction "the growing sentiment in favor of an all-round reduction or cancellation" of war debts in the interest of mutual goodwill and confidence. Prompt American adhesion to the World Court was enthusiastically urged. Amendment of the naturalization law so as to allow citizenship to men who have conscientious scruples against military service was advocated, as was also the abolition of compulsory military training in colleges and of all military training in high schools. The cooperation of the American Government with the League of Nations in seeking a solution of the Manchurian crisis was warmly commended.

The responsibility of the churches in connection with unemployment was another matter that elicited eager attention. A report was adopted which it is expected will be issued jointly with the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

The problem of coordinating denominational programs, not merely on paper in national headquarters, but in actual practice in local communities, was much to the fore. George L. Ford, of Scranton, Pa., representing the local and state federations of churches, made it clear that cooperation will go haltingly until denominational officials approach the community unitedly and work out programs that can be put into operation simultaneously. H. Paul Douglass, of the Institute of Social and Religious Research, interpreting his recent survey of "Protestant Cooperation in American Cities," showed that the denominations have not reached the point of cooperating much except at the points where no denominational interests are involved. It was not very flattering, though obviously in accord with the facts, to be told that cooperation has developed chiefly in response to economic pressure or in those areas where contacts are required with outside agencies - like radio, juvenile courts, and the public school - which simply will not bother to deal separately with a host of agencies. Dr. Douglass urged the denominations to commit certain definite and important responsibilities to the federated bodies, and also to adopt specific and binding principles of comity.

The completion of a decade of service by the Commission on Race Relations was made the occasion of an anniversary dinner. Will W. Alexander of Atlanta and Bishop George C. Clement of Louisville analyzed "What We Have Learned in Ten Years." Dr. Alexander said he had learned, first, that there is a vast gulf between the thinking of the leaders in race relations and the rank and file of the churches; second, that, after having done noteworthy service in educating the Negro, the churches must now give equal energy to developing a community in which an educated Negro can live in self-respect; third, that the basic problem in race relations is segregation. A detailed study of procedures for securing accommodations for church conferences without racial discrimination was submitted and the Executive Committee voted that, in arranging all Federal Council meetings, this should be given special consideration.

The relation of the American churches to the churches of other lands was brought forward in the proposal presented by William Adams Brown in behalf of the Life and Work movement to hold a second Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work in 1935, ten years after the epoch-making Stockholm gathering. The situation confronting Protestantism in Germany today was vividly portrayed by John A. Morehead, President of the Lutheran World Convention, who pointed out the many signs of vitality in spite of the extraordinary difficulties.

Indianapolis was agreed upon as the place for the Quadrennial Meeting of the Council as a whole, to be held next December.



C O P Y

George Sumney, D.D., LL.D.  
Pastor

THIRD PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Pastor's Address  
1707 Esplanade Avenue

New Orleans  
December 11, 1920

Rev. Chas. S. Macfarland, D.D.  
New York City

My dear Dr. Macfarland:

I desire to express my appreciation of all the courtesies shown me by you during the sessions of the Federal Council in Boston.

[The meeting was a very fine one. It came far nearer realising certain ideas than I had supposed it could. The distinctive principle of the church with which I am connected is, as you know, that <sup>of</sup> "hands off" by the church as such in matters which pertain to other than spiritual relations. And yet we perceive, as our General Assembly itself expressed it a few years ago, that there are certain relationships and obligations which Christians as such must deal with, ~~as in Christian social service, etc.~~ The Federal Council, which is not a church, and which is not seeking to unite organically the several bodies composing it, furnishes a most admirable means through which these relationships and duties may find legitimate expression.

It was especially pleasing to me to note the evident desire and effort in the Boston meeting to avoid all divisive questions, to respect the distinctive principles of the several bodies represented there, and to make of the Council an effective agent of all of us in the accomplishment of certain great ends which without some kind of united effort we would never be able to compass.] And I certainly regard the success of the meeting, and its spirit, as chiefly due to your faithful work.

Sincerely and cordially yours,

(Signed) George Sumney

Please let Miss Chase know how greatly we all appreciate her skill and grace and uniform kindness!

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

106 EAST TWENTY-SECOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY

MEMORANDUM

DATE December 14, 1920

FROM Dr. Macfarland TO Dr. Speer

The attached letter from Dr. Sumney is particularly interesting because up to very recent times he has been a most hostile critic of the Federal Council and to some extent a personal critic of myself in the Southern Assembly.

It indicates the general way in which we find men constantly changing their view just as soon as they really comprehend the situation.

Dr. Speer

Charles Bayard Mitchell  
COPY

Charles Bayard Mitchell  
Resident Bishop  
157 North Lexington Boulevard  
St. Paul, Minn.

December 31, 1920

The Reverend Charles S. Macfarland, D.D.  
105 East 22 St., New York City

My dear Doctor Macfarland:

I regret very much that duties here will prevent my attending the meeting of the Executive Committee on January 21st.

I realize with you that we have reached a very critical place in the history of the Council, and that it will require wise statesmanship and careful forelooking to lay well the new foundations of the larger Council which is sure to come. As never before, I am convinced that the Federal Council is of God, and that it has a very important function to fulfill in the Kingdom in the United States. It never had so firm a grip upon the hearts of our Protestant bodies and it was never so well qualified to do a conspicuous work for the Kingdom as now.

I am glad that we have such a splendid president as Doctor Speer, who will give to it not only the standing of his fine name, but the help of his great brain and heart. It is a joy to those of us who know the workings of the Council that you are at the helm, and are so wisely conducting all the interests which cluster around the Council.

I pray God that great wisdom may be given you and the members of the Executive Committee in devising wisely in the interests of the Kingdom of God in the days to come.

With all good wishes for a very happy New Year, and regretting that I cannot be with you, I am

Very sincerely,

(Signed) Charles Bayard Mitchell

Diotated but not read

B

THIS COPY BELONGS TO

*Robert E. Speer*

Boston, Mass.  
December 3, 1920.  
Pp. 1 - 32.

---

# Stenographic Record

---

TITLE

Discussion: HOW CAN THE FEDERAL  
COUNCIL FILL THE LARGEST PLACE OF USEFULNESS  
IN THE CHURCH.

BEFORE

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST  
IN AMERICA.

HORACE A. EDGECOMB  
SHORTHAND REPORTER  
110-117 BARRISTERS HALL  
BOSTON

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA.

Boston, Massachusetts,  
December 3, 1920; 10.30 a.m.

Discussion: "How can the Federal Council fill the largest place of usefulness in the church?" Dr. Robert E. Speer, Chairman of Committee on Methods of Co-operation, presiding.

Dr. SPEER. [Following reading of Report of Committee on Methods of Co-operation.] May I say just one brief word with regard to the wise method of dealing with this report and its recommendations? We might take them up seriatim and discuss them this morning, one by one, and then vote upon them. I venture to suggest that instead of that we refer this resolution to the Business Committee, to bring in at a later session of the Council their recommendations on which we can then vote, and that recommendation is made for two reasons: In the first place there is a large and official committee appointed by the Baptist Board of Promotion, and it is on its way now from Minneapolis to Boston to share in these very discussions. That Committee is wholly sympathetic with what we are seeking here to accomplish. They would be glad to be present when we take definite action on these specific recommendations. They are hoping to be here at least by tomorrow morning. Out of courtesy to them and in our desire to have them present as we reach conclusions in this matter, would it not be wise and Christian for

us to delay our final vote on this matter until they have come? If we refer these resolutions to the Business Committee, that will be possible. In the second place, what we do not want to do this morning is to lose ourselves in questions of secondary importance. We have a great and fundamental issue to face, and without being impeded by the necessity of scrutinizing the phraseology of the resolutions and feeling the constraint of debating small issues, let us face the large general question as to what we believe the churches want done through this Council. And let us remind ourselves that we may keep a right perspective of this matter, of just what this council is. This is the Federal Council which is meeting here this morning. The Federal Council is not a group of individuals about which we are to talk here this morning; we are the Federal Council ourselves, and we are gathered here today to consider this question of what do we believe that the churches who appointed us as their representatives in this council, wish us to do in their name, functioning for them, in the Churches of Christ?

We have all the rest of the morning for this discussion, and unless some other action is better, I suggest that we take the whole matter up as it is now laid out before us, this great problem which confronts us now as to the duty of the church in the situation which now exists, and out of which our ears must be very hard of hearing if they do not touch a great and divine call. The Committee now lays the whole matter before the Council for its consideration.

Dr. GROSE. Mr. Chairman, is a motion in order or needed with regard to a reference of the resolution to the business committee?

Chairman SPEER. Such a motion is in order.

Dr. GROSE. If so, I move that the recommendations of this report be referred to the business committee.

[The motion is seconded.]

Dr. HAWKINS. Would it not be well if in that motion there was a provision for the time when they will report, making it a special order, so that we may know when the matter will come up?

Bishop CANNON. The Business Committee will take it up and work on it.

Chairman SPEER. Will you report tomorrow morning?

Bishop CANNON. We will do so if you desire.

Chairman SPEER. Or this afternoon.

Dr. GROSE. I suggest that if you make it tomorrow morning you will defeat the very purpose which you sought, because I do not believe the delegation which you have mentioned will be able to arrive and take up the matter in that time.

Chairman SPEER. Then Monday morning?

Bishop CANNON. Yes.

Chairman SPEER. The motion is that the matter be referred to the Business Committee to report on Monday morning. Will you discuss the resolution?

[Cries of "Question".]

Bishop NICHOLSON. Do I understand that it will be impossible to have the discussion tomorrow morning?

Chairman SPEER. We will go on with the discussion now.

Bishop NICHOLSON. I understand, but the report? It seems to me very desirable to have the matter dealt with tomorrow morning if possible.

Chairman SPEER. Dr. Grose's suggestion was that the Baptist Delegation will not be here tomorrow morning.

Mr. GROSE. I did not wish to make that suggestion for the purpose of delaying the proceeding, but it was merely by way of explanation.

Chairman SPEER. Would you like a special session Saturday afternoon?

Bishop NICHOLSON. I think that would be very desirable, rather than to have a session on Monday. Whether we like it or not, I know there are a good many delegates who cannot stay over for the Monday session. There are half a dozen of them around me here expressing that view now. This is a very vital matter and it ought to come from every delegate in his seat, and I move that we take it up at some time tomorrow.

Bishop CANNON. When we look over the program we find that the matter is pretty well disposed of by this program and there is little time left unless we put out these other discussions. There is nothing on Saturday afternoon. It may be that the Council will have made up its mind so thoroughly that when the Business Committee reports it will pass the report without discussion, but that has not been my experience with bodies of this size and temper. They usually want to talk and to speak their minds. Unless we abandon some other feature in our program there is no time for any lengthy discussion except this morning and Saturday afternoon. I simply call the attention of the body to that. The Commission will try to be ready with its report at the time designated.

Dr. ANDERSON. I am a member of that Baptist Committee to which reference has been made, and I wish to state that that



Committee makes no request for postponement.

Bishop NICHOLSON. I move that we do now proceed with the discussion in general, and that we hear the report of the Business Committee on the recommendations at a special session tomorrow at 2.15.

Chairman SPEER. Is this motion seconded?

[The motion is seconded.]

Chairman SPEER. Is there discussion? [No response.]

[The question was put and the motion prevailed unanimously.]

Chairman SPEER. We will proceed with the discussion of the whole question.

Bishop SMITH. Mr. Chairman----

Chairman SPEER. Bishop Smith, of Detroit, Michigan, one of the bishops of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Bishop SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am stating it fairly when I say that the possibility of this Federal Council accomplishing the aims and purposes for which it is organized, will be proportionate to the measure of the consistency with which it has followed or pursued the high ideals for which it stands. Whenever in any community it proves itself to be an evangel of enlightenment, inspiration, helpful conservation, comfort and cheer to the masses as well as to the classes, it will be acclaimed by the people and they will rise up and call its name blessed.

In this brief observation touching the question at issue, I beg the chair for its indulgence, in a moment's digression. It is this: On Wednesday, as well as on yesterday, references were made to Mr. Stoddard's book on "The Rising Tide of the Colored Races". In my opinion that title is not or was not

well chosen. A more appropriate one, sir, would be "The Rising Tide of the Self-Consciousness of the Darker Races".

With the seven hundred and a half million of the inhabitants of Asia, the three hundred millions of Africa,--with the millions of the South Sea Islanders, they have been touched by the breath of God, and slowly and surely are rising to meet him at his coming. Moreover, when Woodrow Wilson from his high place as the president of the United States announced his memorable and imperishable Fourteen Points, he unwittingly breathed into the nostrils of the darker races the breath of the inalienable right of self-determination and aroused them to seek for a higher place in the sun of human destiny. It does not follow, Mr. Chairman, that this means a peril, a menace, a threat to the prestige of the people now constituting the vanguard of the world's civilization. Not at all, but rather points to the omen that the Parliament of Man is about to be staged, and that there will ultimately be gathered in all the deserving and worthy elements of mankind, to jubilate the Te Deum, of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man [applause], a brotherhood to which the teachings and practices of Jesus of Nazareth gave birth and vitality, a brotherhood not for some far off distant place and time, beyond the sphere and boundaries of human voice, but to be reduced to a direct, practical and working basis here and now, and to become dominant in one compact, and if this be not true, and I speak now with deepest solemnity and most profound reverence, then, sir, as I see it we are confronted with the stupendous, blighting, withering fact, a fact that severs the heart-strings of those brought

under its folds, a fact shrouded with the blackness of despair, namely that the whole scheme of Christian religion is but a cunningly devised scheme, a mere statement of imagination. Let us therefore tremble lest we offend the least one of the children of the Universal Creator and Father [applause].

Chairman SPEER. I did not interrupt Bishop Smith, but may I suggest that there is an order on Monday morning for consideration of this very question of "The Church and Inter-Racial Problems", and that we should hold as directly as possible to the immediate subject of the morning.

A DELEGATE. I would like to ask one question before this is referred to the Business Committee. The first recommendation speaks of taking such steps as will maintain the closest possible relationship. Does that refer to the last paragraph on page eight?

Chairman SPEER. Do you mean in regard to the tasks of the Federal Council?

The DELEGATE. Taking such steps as will maintain, and so on.

Chairman SPEER. No, it refers to everything,--not to that last paragraph, but to everything.

The DELEGATE. Will it include the last paragraph?

Chairman SPEER. Unquestionably.

A DELEGATE [a lady]. Mr. Chairman, if it is in order for me to make a suggestion regarding the co-operation of the churches----

Chairman SPEER. Is it the co-operation of churches locally?

The DELEGATE. Yes.

Chairman SPEER. I think that will come up under a different discussion at a different session.

Dr. SNOWDEN. It seems to me that we have disposed of the whole matter by sending these resolutions to the Business Committee, and postponing action until tomorrow afternoon. We have nothing to talk about, and don't know what they will bring in. This Committee has brought in these resolutions in this report. Why shouldn't we proceed to discuss these resolutions and vote on them? Tomorrow afternoon possibly only a handful will be here. I imagine many of us have come expecting to go tomorrow afternoon and we have postponed the very heart of this thing until we have gone, and there is nothing to talk about, and it is a discussion which will sweep off into the universe. If it is not too late--

Chairman SPEER. Will you not go on and speak, Dr. Snowden, as though these resolutions were before us?

Dr. SNOWDEN. I cannot do so. That is a supposition contrary to the fact [laughter]. These resolutions, while they are very definite---no committee can give us a masterly digestion of them in so short a time. It has been done for us. I therefore move a reconsideration of the matter. I would like to move that we reconsider with the purpose of taking up these resolutions seriatim, and voting on them now.

Bishop HAVEN. I would like to suggest if Dr. Snowden will permit, I would like to suggest that it is necessary to have this go through the Business Committee at some time or other, and if we should omit it in this major matter we may do it again on many matters. If Dr. Snowden will modify his motion, so that we may discuss and vote upon the matter now

with the understanding that when it is done the matter shall be referred to the Business Committee for phrasing the terms of the resolution, I think it will be satisfactory.

Chairman SPEER. Is that satisfactory?

Dr. SNOWDEN. Haven't you just said that this is the Federal Council, itself, that is discussed here? And if it is so, I think we ought to be in position to act on the resolutions ourselves.

Bishop HAVEN. Then I shall have to move a suspension of the rule.

Mr. DAY. Can we not vote to request the Business Committee to at once report the matter to the Council, and so comply with the By-Laws without delaying the progress of this matter?

Bishop CANNON. The By-Laws say that the Council shall appoint a Committee on Business to which shall be referred all matters connected with the proceedings of the Council while in session. I don't see how you can take it up right now without referring it to the Business Committee. Why not go ahead with the discussion, have the paper before you, and then let the Business Committee take the matter up in the light of the discussion and bring back its reports? It is not likely, if you have your full discussion this morning and the Business Committee meets, that it will attempt to do anything radical. Then you will have your procedure, and the Business Committee will have its discussion, and the Committee will bring it back at some other hour for your final decision.

Chairman SPEER. Is Dr. Snowden's motion seconded?

[Motion seconded.]

Dr. NORTON. A point of order. I call attention to Rule 6 of the By-Laws: "The Council shall appoint a Committee on Business, to which shall be referred all matters connected with the proceedings of the Council while in session, and all such papers and documents as, <sup>to</sup> the Council may seem proper." My suggestion is that there are certain matters which go automatically to the Business Committee and certain other matters within the power of the Council to determine, as to whether they go to the Business Committee or are dealt with directly by the Council. I think it is entirely in the power of the Chairman of the Council to determine whether it should go to the Business Committee.

A DELEGATE. Is not the motion to refer to the Business Committee now pending?

Chairman SPEER. No, that was carried. The motion which was carried was to refer to the Business Committee, and the Business Committee to report at 2.15 tomorrow.

A DELEGATE. What motion is the present discussion proceeding under?

Chairman SPEER. Under Dr. Snowden's motion.

A DELEGATE. I supposed that the motion to refer to the Business Committee was pending, and it was under that motion that the discussion was proceeding.

Chairman SPEER. No, the matter was referred to the Council and it is now moved to take the matter up and vote on the recommendations seriatim.

Dr. McCALL. I am in favor of the motion to refer being reconsidered, not because I have a lack of confidence in the Business Committee or because I suppose that they may not add

something to it, but because the minds of this body are all warmed, and ready to act, and we have been impressed by this report and by these resolutions as evidenced by the stillness of our attention and the longing of our hearts, to talk while we are here in this proceeding this morning, larger than it will be again because we must gradually begin to return home and go to our other tasks,--we are here now in our full power as you, yourself, Mr. Chairman, said we are the Federal Council and the delegates of the denominations, and what possible force can we gain by hesitating? Let us send forth the word on this Friday morning, that the Federal Council right on top of the reading of the report and resolutions, adopted that by a rising vote, and that we mean to say by such rising that we are in favor of that great matchless watchword in the strategy of the War of '61, "Advance the whole line", and that watchword will be reflected in the pulpits on the forthcoming Sabbath Day.

Therefore, I favor the resolution to reconsider and act upon this matter at this morning's session.

Chairman SPEER. Do you not want to vote now so that we can get on?

Dr. BASS. I don't know under what rule this body is operating. We adopted the rules which were in force four years ago, but under our rules is a motion to reconsider debatable?

Chairman SPEER. I think it is.

Dr. ANDERSON. I dislike to differ with so many of my brothers, but I understand that this is a very important report. I feel that after hearing it read we must all agree that it is a very important report. The report says itself that it recommends another step forward,--on page five. It also speaks of

this further step forward as a far larger measure of co-operative action. I, myself, am not able in a few minutes to say just exactly what <sup>that</sup> step means and implies. I don't know that the report makes it absolutely clear, but I take it that that last paragraph on page eight to which I refer in my question, probably takes hold of the most of it, and I feel that if it is a very important matter that perhaps it ought to have some time and consideration by this Council. Of course, <sup>if</sup> it is a matter of just one ordinary step forward, I should not think that it would need consideration, but if it is an extraordinary step forward as I understand the report says, and as the solemnity of this meeting would seem to indicate, I think that perhaps it needs a very careful and particular consideration.

Dr. THOMPSON. I rise to a point of order. This brother would be making an admirable address if it were 15 minutes after this motion is passed. He is debating the matter which will be before us if we can just get this motion to reconsider out of the way.

Dr. ANDERSON. I feel that my address is appropos to the motion to reconsider but I will defer to your judgment in the matter. Now--[laughter, applause, and cries of "Question"] if this is true, and it is a matter of importance, I want to call your attention to a question of not so much importance but it is something like going into the Inter-Church Movement. That was canvassed with all our boards and our denominational representatives again and again before we went in. It took them about 3 or 4 or 5 months to get the consent all around, and I wonder whether we are ready here today to take a step, not so great as that to be sure, but a step analogous to it as I under-



stand the report---which I don't wholly understand---and should we take such a step as that in an hour or an hour and a half? I very much doubt the wisdom of that.

I ran across a quotation from Lord Bacon a little while ago, which Lord Bacon says "Those that will not take time into their councils, time will take its revenge on them."

A DELEGATE. Mr. Chairman, I think we are losing time and the Council can determine what it wants to do. Therefore I move the previous question.

Dr. DAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise----

Chairman SPEER. A motion for the previous question is not debatable.

Dr. DAY. I realize that, but I want to ask a question. There are two points in this motion, one that we reconsider and one that we come to a vote.

Chairman SPEER. No proposal is made that we should come to a vote this morning.

Dr. DAY. I beg your pardon. Didn't it provide that we should reconsider and vote today?

Chairman SPEER. No, it was that we vote seriatim. That is all that was proposed. The question is, shall the main question be put?

[The previous question having been called for, the Council by a vive voce vote order the previous question.]

Chairman SPEER. The previous question is ordered. The question before us is whether we shall reconsider recommitting this report to the Business Committee and now take that report up seriatim for discussion and action in the Council.

[The question was put and the motion prevailed.]

Dr. HAVEN. I move the suspension of the by-law in order that we may vote without recourse to the Business Committee.

Dr. THOMPSON. I raise the question whether this vote this morning may not be an informal vote and then refer to the Business Committee so that the Business Committee may make any minor changes in the phraseology and then let the final vote be taken when that has been done. We can then take the final vote after the Business Committee have reviewed this discussion, in accordance with the By-Laws. If it is in order I make a motion that the seriatim vote be regarded as an informal vote to be referred to the Business Committee.

[The motion is seconded.]

Dr. MILLER. I move that the Business Committee report this afternoon.

Bishop CANNON. I wish to say that we have no desire to magnify the prerogatives of the Committee, but we have this By-Law and the words "proceedings of the Council",--"all matters connected with the proceedings of the Council" is very sweeping. It means what it says or nothing.

This is clearly a very important proceeding of the Council and the only question we must be careful to consider is,--Do we want to set a precedent here that will plague us later on? I cannot agree with Dr. Miller that the Committee should be directed to report back this afternoon. If it is referred to us it is for a purpose. If the Committee should report tomorrow morning, it will require nothing I think but a vote of the Council. I hope you will stand by your by-laws, and after discussion send it to the Business Committee and let the Committee report tomorrow morning.

Chairman SPEER. The question is on Dr. Thompson's motion. Are you prepared to vote on that?

A DELEGATE. State the motion.

Chairman SPEER. The motion is that when we act on these it be in the nature of an informal expression of the Council, that it then go to the Business Committee later, to be formally reported back tomorrow morning.

Dr. NORTON. I think we could report at the close of business this afternoon.

Chairman SPEER. Is that agreeable?

[The question was put and the motion prevailed.]

Dr. VANCE. The subject matter is comprehensive, the time available to us is limited, and if we indulge in unrestricted debate on the report we may be able to reach the main issue. Therefore I move that instead of discussing these articles seriatim we take up for general discussion the question, whether or not it is the sentiment of this body that the powers of the Council be enlarged in accordance with this report. That is the great issue before us: Let us talk to it. I make the motion,--if I can get a second.

Chairman SPEER. Shall we take them up as a body? The motion has been seconded. Those in favor of the motion will say Aye---

A DELEGATE. Mr. Chairman----

Chairman SPEER. I am putting a motion.

The DELEGATE. I rise to a point of order, that the motion is out of order. We have adopted an order of procedure and the motion contravenes it.

Chairman SPEER. I think the point is well taken.

Dr. HUMPHREYS. I move that each speaker be limited to three minutes.

[This motion having been seconded, the question was put and the motion prevailed.]

Chairman SPEER. The discussion is on recommendation one, and the speakers are limited to three minutes.

Dr. HUMPHREYS. I wish to say that if the speakers will turn their faces this way [to the rear] instead of toward the platform we shall be able to hear.

A DELEGATE. Mr. Chairman I move the adoption of the first recommendation.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. HERMAN. I want to call attention to the fact that as a member of the Council whose good fortune it has been to be engaged in this work, I want to express my entire conviction that the time has come for action---and it means that the night is far spent and the day is at hand. There was a night in connection with our work. I have felt again and again that in the providence of God we are doing great things and that we were not doing quite enough and that the lack of great deeds was on account of, and due to, shall I say, insufficient confidence on the part of constituent bodies. The war has taught us one thing, that we must go forward together in co-operative work if we are to gain the objectives of our undertaking. We should be agreed on the great program that we will work together for God and man. And I trust that this report which has been submitted will lead to great courage and confidence, that we may now focus and coalesce all the passion in our hearts for Christianizing the nations and all the international movements.

I am heartily in accord with the spirit and the thought of your resolution.

Chairman SPEER. We have before us the resolution to adopt recommendation one. [Cries of question.] Are you ready for the question?

[The question was put and the motion prevailed unanimously.]

Chairman SPEER. Recommendation No. 2?

A DELEGATE. I move that it be adopted.

[The motion was seconded, and without discussion the question was put and the motion prevailed unanimously.]

Chairman SPEER. Recommendation No. 3?

A DELEGATE. I move its adoption.

Bishop NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, under the recommendation numbered three, I want to say that I am in favor of adopting it, but I think we all need this word of explanation. That involves an appropriation. Now, there are some of us who can only vote our judgment and our pledge to recommend that action because we have to report ad interim to the respective bodies which we represent, and who alone can make the appropriation. So that we vote our judgment and our pledge to support it, but we can only give definite assurance after vote of our respective bodies.

Chairman SPEER. It is so understood.

Dr. CARTER. When we vote to raise this amount of money we must have our churches in mind. They have been and are confronted with a great many drives. When the proposition is presented to them they want to know what is to be secured by the money to be raised. They will have this remarkable report on the part of the Committee and I can <sup>say</sup> so although my name is

is appended to it, for I have had very little to do with it, but I believe that we must go before our churches in a way to show them more specifically than this report presented, just what the specific gains will be. Therefore, I will ask you, Mr. President, to state three of the major developments that would come in connection with the raising of this \$300,000.

Chairman SPEER. Dr. Carter's question was brought before the Committee at its last meeting and it was considered when whether as a part of this report it might not be wise to submit for the Committee an itemized budget covering the year before us. That budget was prepared, but it was feared that if we went into those details we might lose ourselves and pass by the central issue. The question, however, is an entirely just one and in carrying these recommendations out we shall have to be supplied with an itemized statement that will justify a total of \$300,000. I might say just in general that Mr. Kimball's report shows that for the last quadrennium it has been \$181,000 per annum; and that the budget of the Federal Council for the past year, as drawn up at the beginning, as to what they would like to do if funds can be secured, called for \$300,000. Only as much can be undertaken as funds can be provided for.

The whole matter will have to be re-scrutinized on that basis, because the Federal Council will not spend money which it does not have actually in sight. It will be able to undertake only as much of this program as is authoritatively provided for in advance. We should be glad to submit here today perhaps Dr. MacFarland can bring it in, the detailed budget which makes up the \$300,000, or it may cover Dr. Carter's point

if the main objects are mentioned.

Dr. CARTER. That is what I would like, to have stated the three large features.

Chairman SPEER. You will find them on page 8 of this report.

I  
 Dr. MacFARLAND. I think, ought to add that in many cases it will not be simply the adding of new departments, but the re-constituting of departments and enlarging them. So that after the Council has decided what it will do it is simply a process of adding on but also of readjustment.

A DELEGATE. In our reports we constantly state that we represent nineteen million church members. Two cents a year will raise \$380,000, or more than the amount which is called for. Not 2 cents a day, or 2 cents a week, but 2 cents a year!

Dr. NORTH. There is a matter which you will wish to know. We are proceeding on the per capita basis. We began that way and it seems the best way, but you will see at once that that means that the denominations who have the largest membership are expected to pay the largest amount of money. I am not making a plea for the church which I particularly represent, because it ought to pay, or that it has to pay per capita, but for large organizations connected with the Federal Council which never has made the per capita payment, and I suppose would find it very difficult to make it. And I am calling attention to this, so that you will perhaps see your way clear to ask the Business Committee or the Administrative Committee to find such additional methods, or modification of methods for allotting the amount involved as will bring an equitable

distribution according not merely to the numbers but according to the giving power of the denominations.

I will not say more, but I call your attention to the fact that if this is passed in the present form, it will be wise, in my judgment, that there should be some such suggestion or power given to your Administrative Committee.

Chairman SPEER. The Committee assumes that the Administration Committee will have to exercise its functions.

Dr. HAWKINS. The remarks made prompt me to inquire how far the Committee has considered this question of means, in making this recommendation. I know that denominations are asked to pay on their per capita basis, but very few I understand pay their per capita. And I would like to ask how near the full quota comes to reaching the \$300,000.

Chairman SPEER. The question that Professor Hawkins asks is whether all denominations are now paying the proportions allotted to them?

Dr. HAWKINS. Whether the proportions allotted to them would amount to \$300,000 if they were paid.

Dr. MacFARLAND. Oh, no, if they were paid in full they would amount to perhaps \$16,000. As a matter of fact they amount in actual payment to \$12,000. The Baptist denomination has many members, and in some respects they cannot pay as much as the Methodist Episcopal. It shrinks as a matter of fact to \$12,000 and we get some small items from denominations or denominational organizations.

Mr. SMITH. I think we are all clear about this matter, but we are in danger of getting into a very sad plight. The adoption of recommendation 3 would not mean of course that the



Federal Council would be exclusively limited to these appropriations. On the contrary we should understand that it was free to receive whatever individuals might wish to give to promote this work.

Mr. I signed this report and am delighted with it. I favor it heartily. I think, however, 'sitting here this morning together, we must remember that this recommendation is exceedingly practicable, and that we will carry this back to our constituent bodies with the expectation that it will be scrutinized very thoroughly, and that we must be prepared to give full reasons for the faith that is in us.

Now, for my own church, the Methodist Episcopal Church South, I figured that down, and we will have one-tenth of this amount. We have over 2,000,000 members, and we will have about \$30,000 a year to ask our General Conference to appropriate for this Council. I shall be delighted to ask our Conference to do that, and I am sure our Council members here will join with me. But this is a request, and it does not bind the denomination. If I may say a word in connection with recommendation No. 4, because it ties in with it----

Chairman SPNER. We will come to No. 4 subsequently.

Mr. It ties in with it financially and that proposes a conference with the church board. Those interchurch boards at present are receiving appropriations from their board. I, myself, am heartily in favor of some method by which interchurch boards will be such a part of the organization of the Federal Council that the budget can in some way be dovetailed, so that we will get from our church boards in some way part of this sum.

Chairman SPEER. Are you ready to vote on No. 3?

Mr. MILLER. It was impressed on us yesterday that we should keep in mind the inter-denominational situation. If we, as representatives of churches, mean business, it is our duty to go back to our churches after the Committee has devised the method, and see to it that the Advisory body as well as through the inter-relation of the Board, secures the funds. A man's interest is in proportion to his investment usually, and the church's interest in the work of the Federal Council will be increased tremendously if we can see to it that <sup>in</sup> the budget of the denominational work the Federal Council is suitably represented by a proper sum to be raised by the churches or through the Advisory Body. That is after all the real question which is before us, if we adopt this today.

A DELEGATE. Following Bishop Cannon's question, do we understand that this \$300,000 is in addition to such sums as will come from the various organizations, foreign missionary and other conferences?

Chairman SPEER. It is.

The DELEGATE. You have answered for us one point which is in most of our minds, that you will not spend any money which you do not have. You are not to go on and spend \$300,000, and then run away and leave our churches to bury the corpse and pay the expenses.

Chairman SPEER. You are right.

The DELEGATE. That is understood and settled.

Chairman SPEER. It is.

The DELEGATE. I am ready to vote [laughter].

Mr. KIMBALL. Nothing has been more interesting to the

Treasurer of the Federal Council than the correspondence with the various denominations in regard to these apportionments. Thirty denominations raise their money in thirty different ways, and pay it out in thirty different ways, and each case has had to be treated individually. But over it all there has been the most cordial desire to do everything possible to carry out the work of the Federal Council. In all these matters there has been a very considerable education, and a change in the last few years. The war itself has shown the denominations how by special appeals they can raise great sums for work outside of their churches. And I believe it will be possible for churches who find it hard work to meet a per capita appropriation, to raise special funds to meet this inter-denominational work.

Dr. ASHEBY. There is one point, one issue in our action today, which we can in no wise control, but which we will undoubtedly by this action assist, and that is the internal condition of our different denominations in administering their support for all co-operative movements. We are well aware that there is growing up within every denomination a centralizing tendency which is in the direction of unifying all missionary and benevolent action of the denominations, and that same centralizing tendency will be emphasized by our action here today, and will find its expression as time passes, in this practical issues. The denominations will undertake soon to finance all co-operative board movements, and six or seven are named on page six of this report, which will be continued as inter-board, or inter-denomination, co-operative movements. Seven of the eight there named will be

continued. I can readily see, and I think we should have it in mind that pretty soon the denominations centralizing their own financing within their own limit will undertake to make one appropriation to cover all of these inter-denominational movements, and we ought not to take this action in the way of a final step soon to be taken, but that a process of gradual action looking to the consolidation of all financing of inter-church movement should be arranged.

Mr. WHISTLER. I want to say that our church has gone into this undertaking with considerable opposition. There are many obstacles which have been raised. And to those who object, this financial situation is a source of objection. Now I want to ask, in order to remain a member of the organization, must we accept this assessment?

Chairman SPEER. No.

Mr. WHISTLER. If we do not, will it affect our membership in any way?

Chairman SPEER. No.

Mr. WHISTLER. It is not too much, and it is a very moderate amount to ask of our church members, but getting the other fellow to see that is another matter. I want to make that clear because I cannot vote for this unless it is with the understanding that it is not essential to our remaining a member.

Chairman SPEER. It is not.

[The motion having been seconded, the question was put and the motion unanimously prevailed.]

Chairman SPEER. We will next consider recommendation 4.

A VOICE. I move its adoption.

[The motion is seconded.]

Mr. FRANK [Of Dallas, Texas.] I want to raise this question: whether or not it would be wise to include in the scope of recommendation 4 the calling into that conference of the presiding officers of the supreme bodies of the various denominations; with this idea in mind, that the things proposed at that meeting will have to come back to the conferences and the assemblies for action, and it is very much more likely to have favorable action taken if the presidents or the presiding officers, those who are responsible for that action, were present when the action were initiated. I don't wish to involve the question by any motion, but to raise the question here.

Chairman SPEER. It is a fair question to raise for the Council to decide. I am inclined to think that special action would have to be taken to cover the point raised by the gentleman from Texas.

Dr. CLEMENT. May it be understood in this section here, that any question directed to the denominations as such,--- that they would be communicated with,--that we deal with the denominations and the boards of a denomination rather than with the group? I raise this question because of another one closely connected with it. It seems that in certain matters there are those who are dealt with in a group,--industrial groups, racial groups. I will not raise the question that Bishop Smith tried to raise, because he referred it back to Monday, and yet I will say that there are many of us who have almost decided to absent ourselves from the meetings on Monday

because many times when a particular matter of racial significance has been put on the program a person outside of our own group is put up to represent us. If we are to have closer representation, then the matters ought to be dealt with by and through us.

Chairman SPEER. The resolution was carefully phrased to to meet this very point which you raise. This resolution is intended to safeguard the very thing which you have in mind.

Dr. FISHER. I notice among the bodies who are described as the agencies the missionary body does not appear, and I understand that it is because that movement is a self-perpetuating body. It might be well in this connection to call attention to the clause in the second paragraph of the resolution on page 6,--

"The personnel program and all other arrangements of the conference to be determined by the chairman and general secretary or other two officials of each of the foregoing agencies in consultation."

The personnel as well as those other aspects of this important conference. Undoubtedly this joint committee, if we should recommend this plan, would be well advised, and I hope you will give very careful consideration to the recommendation of the delegate who has spoken from Texas. It will be perfectly proper, <sup>for us</sup> to recommend to this Committee a favorable consideration of the representatives of all agencies, denominational, and inter-denominational, but it would hardly seem wise for us to particularize this morning as to particular organizations.

Bishop NICHOLSON. On that point I may say that suitable attention has already been given to the method of procedure

under this resolution. For instance, it is suggested that an early conference should be called in which there should be at least five representatives of each of these organizations. Now, the missionary educational movement is at present, by its own action, a part of one of these organizations which has been paying its full share. The same thing is true of other missionary movements and was provided for in that representation. Now, the suggestion was made at the last conference that in addition, that representation already mentioned of these six or seven organizations, there should be admitted to the conference other representatives, the desire being to frame up if possible what would be the united judgment, and what would be so representative of the different shades of opinion that it might possibly represent the thing that united protestantism would want. We want to get all that, if we can. Then after that report is framed, it will immediately go for consideration to each of these bodies, now the whole missionary body, the foreign missionary council and so on, representing their churches. And each of those bodies is between now and the first of January going to hold their annual meeting and there will be consideration there, and then, as I understand it, after that discussion at that meeting, it will come back to the Federal Council for final consideration, and that is thoroughly representative of the churches. Am I correct?

Chairman SPEER. Yes. You have 5 minutes left now before the close of the meeting. Do you wish to vote on these now or defer them to another time?

A DELEGATE. Now.

[Cries of "Question".]

Chairman SPEER. Do you wish to vote on No. 4?

[The question was put and the motion unanimously prevailed.]

Chairman SPEER. No. 5.

A VOICE. I move its adoption.

Chairman SPEER. Is the motion seconded?

[The motion was seconded, the question was put and the motion prevailed unanimously.]

Chairman SPEER. Item No. 6.

Dr. SUMMERS. Mr. President, I move with reference to recommendation 6, that recommendation six be referred to the Business Committee with direction at once to frame such a By-Law as shall cover the matter of the appointment, duties and powers of commissions and of an administrative committee. My desire is that it be referred to the Committee to frame a By-Law.

Chairman SPEER. You are instructing the Committee?

Dr. SUMMERS. Yes, that the Committee shall frame such a By-Law as will conform to the recommendation.

Chairman SPEER. Do you desire to discuss the motion to refer No. 6 to the Business Committee to draft the By-Law?

Dr. MacFARLAND. The difficulty there is that this matter of the conference with the inter-board matters is related to that. It would be difficult to shape such a By-Law.

Dr. SUMMERS. The object of my motion is to get as quick action as possible in this resolution. The Administrative Committee is nothing but an arm of the Executive Committee, and yet the Administration Committee has a very large power. The Council at Cleveland, and at another meeting, ordered a



certain Committee. The Administration Committee was directed by the Council. In October the Administrative Committee met and consolidated the three committees, two established by the Council and one by themselves, and that has come about in this way. The Administrative Committee is not mentioned in either our Constitution or By-Laws, and the purpose of my motion is that the Business Committee may prepare a By-Law which will include the Administrative Committee in the Committee organization of this body in full conformity with the existing practice.

Dr. NORTH. We are the creatures of opportunism, and we have done the best that we could under that law. I suggest that the motion be modified to ask the Business Committee if it cannot frame a By-Law at this time to report on this matter with a view to properly framing this matter. It may be difficult for them to prepare a By-Law to cover everything.

Bishop CANNON. The matter was taken up this morning, is under favorable consideration by the Committee and will be reported later.

[The motion relative to No. 6 having been seconded, the question was put and the motion prevailed unanimously.]

Chairman SPEER. No. 7? If you will pardon me, I very much desire to present at this time, Bishop Talbot of the Episcopal Church, of Pennsylvania. [Prolonged applause.]

Bishop ETHELBERT TALBOT.

I want to express my appreciation of your invitation to all our representatives of the Episcopal Church, to participate with you in this conference, and to assure you that our hearts beat in universal sympathy with the grand motives which animate you. We articulate with you in a corporate way not at all, but rather through two of our committees, the Committee on Christian Unity and the Committee on Social Service. Both Committees are well represented on your Board, and I make it a point to go to every meeting of the Federal Council where there may be an opportunity to promote the co-operative work which is being done.

Now, in regard to Item No. 7 in the report, expressing the hope that out of this may come a richer form of expression of the spirit of fellowship, service and co-operation, it is a thing in which I am deeply concerned. I suppose none of you gentlemen realize more fully than I do what an enormous contribution the Federal Council has made for the cultivation of the atmosphere in which alone Christian unity can ever be achieved. I have just come from the Lambeth Conference in which the church to which I happen to belong, that branch of the Christian church, has made a very great pronouncement and a very great declaration to all Christian people throughout the length and breadth of the universe. As one good brother said "You bishops have got down off your high horse". Perhaps that is a good way to put it, but we have asked the loving, sympathetic consideration of what we have said on the question of closer co-operation for which the Federal Council stands,

the consummation of the reunion of the broken branches of Christ's church, and we recognize fully that every baptized man in this universe is a full member of the Holy Catholic Church to which we belong [applause], just as much as we are. We unchurch nobody. We recognize the Christian ministry of every church on the face of the earth [applause] and we go further and say that we are ready to get on our knees, if need be, practically we say that, before the authorities of any Christian church on the face of the earth and receive from that body any such ordination as they may give us, so that we may be a free and recognized minister of that church.

I should like to be a recognized minister of brother <sup>Ainslie's</sup> Haynes church, because I love him so and if he will ordain me I will come and take it.

We express this hope, and I don't know how you will receive it. But I want to ask you to pray in the charity of your hearts that the motives which have inspired us may receive encouragement and co-operation and sympathy from Christian men everywhere. [Applause.]

Chairman SPEER. I want to have the pleasure of introducing to the Council also my friend Bishop Gillie, president of the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. Bishop Talbot has said that the great church which he represents is not articulated in any way with the Federal Council. If he will take one of my hands, and Bishop Gillie the other, we will begin the corporate articulation. [Applause.]

May I take this same opportunity to ask if our friend,

Dr. Newbold, President of the United Lutheran Church will not rise, so that we may see his face. [Dr. Newbold standing.] [Applause.] We welcome him here with all our hearts to this brotherly fellowship.

We have before us the recommendation No. 7.

A DELEGATE. I move to adopt it, but we ought to change that word "hope" to "conviction" in the first line, and the word "may" to the word "shall" in the second line. Can we not pass this resolution in this way, that "The Council expresses the conviction that out of the experiences and discussions of the present time there shall come the achievement" and so forth. Having adopted all these other resolutions, our hope has come to a realization.

Chairman SPEER. Do you wish to vote on that or refer it to the Business Committee?

[Cries of "Question".]

Chairman SPEER. An amendment is offered, to change the word "hope" to "conviction", and "may" to "shall".

[The motion having been put, the amendment was adopted.]

Chairman SPEER. Are you ready to vote on the recommendation as amended?

[The question was put and the motion prevailed unanimously.] The effect of our action is to informally adopt these recommendations, and they go now to the Business Committee.

A DELEGATE. I move that the matter be referred to the Business Committee with instructions to report back at the earliest possible moment, this afternoon if practicable.

[The motion having been seconded, the question was put and the motion prevailed.]

[Conference closed.]

